REMARKS

Claims 8-9, 15, 18 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. In response, Applicant amended claims 8, 18 and 21 to include the feature of outputting data including a processing result by the specified and executed business class to an apparatus that displays the form screen. Since the outputting of data to the apparatus that displays the form screen is a tangible, concrete and useful result, withdrawal of the §101 rejection of claims 8-9, 15, 18 and 21 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warden (U.S. Publication 2003/0149934) in view of Chandra et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0138582). In response, Applicant amended the claims, and respectfully traverses the rejection based on these amendments and for the reasons recited below.

With respect to claims 1-7, 16-17 and 19-20, Applicant amended these claims to clarify that the business class is a class before compilation and to be created, and respectfully traverses the rejection as it applies to these claims for at least this reason. In the outstanding rejection on page 5, last paragraph, it is acknowledged that Warden does not explicitly teach that a business class is encoded in an object oriented programming language. Instead, it is asserted that Chandra teaches this feature.

Chandra discloses in paragraph [0402] registering a new building block when development of a new building block is complete. However, both Chandra and Warden fail to disclose or suggest registering the item of the specified business class, which is a class before compilation and to be created. Both Warden and Chandra fail

12

to disclose or suggest preparing the business class without any excess and deficiency, or to shorten a development period that enables development of a business program with higher quality. Both Warden and Chandra, taken alone or in combination, provide no teaching, motivation, or suggestion for combining the registering of the item of the specified business class, which is a class before compilation and to be created. For at least this reason, withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of claims 1, 7, 16, 17, 19-20 and their respective dependent claims is respectfully requested.

Dependent claim 4 further recites the analyzing and specifying as comprising specifying a pre-processing class, a post-processing class and a form processing class. Since neither Warden nor Chandra disclose or suggest this feature, withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of claim 4 for this additional reason is respectfully requested.

Claim 6 calls for referring to a form item storing object manager in which items of form item storing objects to be created are registered, and judging whether an item of the specified form item storing object has been registered in the form item storing object manager. Since neither Warden nor Chandra discloses or suggests this feature, withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of claim 6 for this additional reason is respectfully requested.

Pending claims 2-3 and 5 are traversed based on the features recited in these claims, and also for the reasons recited with respect to the rejection of independent claim 1.

With respect to claims 8-15, 18 and 21, the Office Action acknowledges on page 13, second paragraph that does not seem to specify explicitly enough the step

of executing the specified business class. However, the Office Action asserts Chandra teaches this feature.

However, neither Warden nor Chandra discloses or suggests generating and outputting data including a processing result by the specified and executed business class to an apparatus that displays the form screen. Chandra also fails to disclose or suggest a business class that corresponds to the tag included in the XML data and is an executable program for carrying out a processing related to the tag. Since Warden and Chandra, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest specifying a business class or outputting data including a processing result by the specified and executed business class to an apparatus that displays the form screen, withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of claims 8-15, 18 and 21 is respectfully requested.

Claim 9 recites the aforementioned features as recited in claim 4. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 9 for the reasons recited with respect to claim 4.

Claims 11 recites the feature of opening data to an interclass interface object that is defined in advance and is loaded into the memory by a first business class, in order to transfer the data from the first business class to the second business class. Claim 15 recites the feature of the executed business classes being configured so as to complete a processing for the entire form relating to the form screen by a processing of the executed business classes without a program defining a processing sequence. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 11 and 15 based on these features, and also for the reasons provided above.

14

Applicant further traverses the rejections of claims 10 and 12-14 for the features recited in these claims, and also based on their dependence from independent claim 8. For these reasons, withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of claims 1-21 is respectfully requested.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that this Application is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By   *Joseph P. Fox*
            Joseph P. Fox
            Registration No. 41,760

September 11, 2007
300 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 360-0080
Customer No. 24978